

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 11-22 have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments. For instance, support for the amendments appears e.g. at page 9; page 23, lines 20-21; and the original claims of the application.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over US 2002/0090572. The rejection is traversed.

New independent claims 11 (the only pending independent claim) calls for:

Claim 11. A photoimageable composition comprising a photoactive component and a polymer component,
the polymer component comprising a fluorinated polymer that comprises Si atoms and silanol groups,
wherein the polymer: (i) photoacid-labile groups; (ii) comprises at least three distinct repeat units; (iii) is at least substantially free of aromatic groups; and (iv) has a ratio of fluorine atoms to Si atoms of 2.9 or less.

Nowhere does the cited US 2002/0090572 suggest such a photoimageable composition including a polymer as recited in Applicants' claim 11. The cited polymer of Example 2 of US 2002/0090572 does not have at least three distinct repeat units or photoacid-labile groups. Reference to paragraph 61 of US 2002/0090572 does not cure such shortcomings of US 2002/0090572, i.e. use of a monomer listed at paragraph 61 does not provide a polymer with photoacid-labile groups, or necessarily a ratio of fluorine atoms to Si atoms of 2.9 or less, as Applicants claim.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are earnestly solicited. See *In re Marshall*, 198 USPQ 344, 346 (CCPA 1978) ("[r]ejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art.")

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over US 2004/0265754. The rejection is traversed.

US 2004/0265754 is cited for a polymer having a ratio of fluorine atoms to Si atoms of 3.0 or less.

Applicants' independent claim 11 calls for ratio of fluorine atoms to Si atoms of 2.9 or less.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested. See *In re Marshall, supra*.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
(617) 439-4444